

SECRET

1697

DD/S 70-1125

Training 3-1

FILED

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Support

SUBJECT : Career Training

1. OTR did not object to the ceiling of 100 for the Career Training Program for FY '70 and '71. But at this stage of adjusting to drastic changes in the Program, with new and important problems certain to arise, we do not believe that a permanent ceiling of 100 from FY '72 onward can be reconciled with a properly managed Program of 50 per year. With that ceiling the alternatives are to reduce the number considerably below 50 or to shorten the time-span for each CT well below two years. Either of these choices raises severe questions as to the utility of the Program. If the number is much diminished, the Program becomes uneconomical -- a drain on the total resources of OTR altogether disproportionate to the small number trained. If the time is much shorter, we considerably increase the likelihood of unsatisfactory placement, dissatisfaction on the part of both CTs and supervisors, and the kind of attrition that the new Program was designed to avoid.

2. This problem of ceiling was surfaced on 10 November 1969: in a meeting with you and Messrs. Coffey, Clarke, and others, Colonel White decided to reduce the Program ceiling for FYs '70 and '71 from 169 to 100. The Chief, CTP, who was also present, pointed out that the new figure would be workable for FYs '70 and '71 but that a ceiling of approximately 129 would be necessary to operate the Program in FY '72 at the level of 50 per year. Colonel White replied that the situation would be examined and decided upon when the time came. We have proceeded on the assumption that we would have some opportunity to profit from experience with the new Program and the Agency's changing personnel situation before this possibility was permanently foreclosed.

SECRET

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

SECRET

3. You will recall that you and I discussed the problem of AE as it affected the 100 ceiling. At the time you made it clear that AE was a budgetary problem that could be handled if necessary by other means available to you. This would probably suffice to handle an occasional overage, but the problem here is a question of permanent overage. The worst effect of this would be on those individuals we would have to push off our rolls at the end of the fiscal year to come down to ceiling. If this happens, I foresee injustice and haphazard handling of such individuals. The problem is with slots, not budget: to devise a T/O which will allow us to carry out the plan to recruit up to 50 every year. The best forecast that we can make must be based on many new factors for FY '72 and onward on which, at present, we have little experience or basis for judgment. For example, we cannot confidently predict how many of each year's enrollment will be Internals, or the extent of their previous training, though this will have a profound effect on the average length of time a class will be in the Program. We cannot yet guess what will be the most effective make-up of the CT training effort, as, for example, between one or two runnings per year of all the courses CTs now take, though this will vitally affect the mix, frequency, and content of many other courses. Two runnings a year with fewer than 25 CTs each will require a steady flow of non-CTs into such courses if they are to be cost-effective. We cannot at this stage count on such a steady flow. Thus nearly all the arguments adduced below as to the consequences of various alternatives can only over the next year or two be based on experience and likely prospects. As you know we have agreed, especially with the DD/P, that we will accelerate transferring those CTs whose placement is generally recognized to be acceptable to all parties. But we have no idea how many will be so involved or how many months this may average; our own criterion must be an assurance that each trainee is appropriately placed and is being suitably challenged and developed.

4. Following is a breakdown of the alternatives to our Program Call proposal as we see them and the implications of each one. I remain of the opinion that the projection of 129 for FYs '72 - '76 used in the Program Call provides the best hope for achieving the stated objectives of the CT Program. It is perfectly possible that experience may show the feasibility of reducing the average time per person in the Program; if so, I shall not object when the time comes. In the meantime, I believe it would be wrong to foreclose a careful adjustment to future reality.

SECRET

SECRET

a. Annual selection of 50 CTs retained in CT status an average of 23 months; (nine months on-the-job attachment after completion of training):

It may be that this alternative will prove practicable but with a very tight margin. It assumes (we have no basis for such an assumption) that 50% of all CTs will be Internals, entering the Program the precise month a class starts, and that some of them will be transferred earlier than nine months because of prior experience and performance record. This projection does not include provision for CTs who fall out of cycle for reasons of illness, injury, need to be recycled and redirected, involuntarily separated, or whose transfers to operating components are delayed by the same ceiling considerations that affect the Program. Contingencies of this kind do arise and in the past have required 5% allowance over basic AE requirements. This alternative is estimated to require for FY 1972 and thereafter a ceiling of 97 and an Average Employment level of 109. (See attached chart.)

b. Annual selection of 50 CTs retained in CT status an average of 21 months (seven months on-the-job attachment after completion of training):

Although this projection would nearly conform to a limitation of 100 in FY 1972 (97 Ceiling, 102 AE), we do not regard it as practicable because the seven-month attachment, in our experience, is not long enough to validate the trainee's suitability for the particular assignment and to determine as well that his early career development and professional growth are taking place satisfactorily. This is the key break-in period which has been specified in several Agency studies and exit interviews as being poorly handled.

c. Annual selection of 40 CTs retained in CT status an average of 27 months (12 months on-the-job attachment after completion of training):


SECRET

SECRET

This alternative would result in the Program's exceeding the limitation of 100 on Ceiling and Average Employment. Estimated Ceiling and AE for this alternative are 115 and 112.5, respectively. Moreover, we would question the economic justification for maintaining a Program with an annual selection level of only 40 CTs.

d. Annual selection of 40 CTs retained in CT status an average of 23 months (nine months on-the-job attachment after completion of training):

This level program would conform to the 100 limitation with an estimated ceiling requirement of 92 and an Average Employment requirement of 100. Again, however, it relies upon Internals for at least half its input and makes no provision for a CT's falling out of cycle. There seems little sense, economic or otherwise, to operating a Program at such a tight margin for only 40 CTs annually. It is not a reasonable alternative.


HUGH T. CUNNINGHAM
Director of Training

25X1

Att

DD/S Distribution:

Orig - Filed in Plans Staff with OTR Program Call Response, FY 1972-1976

1 - DD/S Subject

1 - DD/S Chrono

SECRET

25X9

Approved For Release 2003/04/29 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700120011-9

Approved For Release 2003/04/29 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003700120011-9